



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,638	08/25/2003	Joshy Joseph	POU920030044US1	3890
7590 Cantor Colburn LLP 55 Griffin Road South Bloomfield, CT 06002			EXAMINER PATEL, CHIRAG R	
			ART UNIT 2141	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/25/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/648,638

Applicant(s)

JOSEPH, JOSH Y

Examiner

Chirag R. Patel

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☒ Other: NPL Document

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-13, 15-28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoschek (Wolfgang Hoschek, November 2002, Int'l. IEEE/ACM Supercomputing Conference (SC 2002), Baltimore, USA, November 2002. IEEE Computer Society Press., "The Web Service Discovery Architecture", pages 1-15) in view of DMTF (Specification DSP 0201, Version 2.1, May 02, 2002, "Specification for the Representation of CIM in XML, pages 1-31).

As per claims 1 and 16, Hoschek discloses a method for mapping Open Grid Services Architecture (OSGA) service data to a native resource representation thereof, the method comprising: defining a set of standard mapping rules for service data descriptions in a service-oriented architecture; and utilizing an OSGA Service Data Mapping Language (OSDML) configured to implement mapping of the OSGA service data. (Page 9, Section 6: Paragraphs 2 and 3) Hoschek fails to disclose utilizing an

Art Unit: 2141

OSGA Service Data Mapping Language (OSDML) configured to implement mapping of the OSGA service data to a native resource representation thereof, through extensible language features. Hoschek fails to disclose wherein said set of standard mapping rules are implemented through an OSGA Service Data Mapping Language (OSDML) configured to support complex mapping through extensible language features.

DMTF discloses wherein said set of standard mapping rules are implemented through an OSGA Service Data Mapping Language (OSDML) configured to support complex mapping through extensible language features. (Section 2: A note on Mapping Choices) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to disclose wherein said set of standard mapping rules are implemented through an OSGA Service Data Mapping Language (OSDML) configured to support complex mapping through extensible language features in the disclosure of Hoschek. The motivation for doing so would have been to reduce the complexity of management and administration of XML mappings, more validation power and slightly more intuitive representation of CIM in XML. (Section 2: A note on Mapping Choices)

As per claims 2 and 17, Hoschek / DMTF disclose the method of claim 1, and Hoschek discloses wherein said OSDML is an extensible markup language (XML). (Page 9, Section 6: Paragraphs 2 and 3)

As per claims 3 and 18, Hoschek / DMTF disclose the method of claim 1, and Hoschek discloses wherein said OSDML defines an extensible set of at least one of:

Art Unit: 2141

data source mechanisms and resource access mechanisms. (Page 9, Section 6: Paragraph 4, Page 11: Table 2)

As per claims 4 and 19, Hoschek / DMTF disclose the method of claim 1, and Hoschek wherein said OSDML defines parameterization capabilities for supporting dynamic values. (Pages 9-10, Section 6, Paragraph 5)

As per claims 5 and 20, Hoschek / DMTF disclose the method of claim 1, and Hoschek discloses wherein said OSDML defines executable scripts to process data transformation and queries. (Page 8: Openness and Flexibility, Page 10: Paragraph 2)

As per claims 6 and 21, Hoschek / DMTF disclose the method of claim 1, and Hoschek discloses wherein said OSDML defines a mechanism for defining private mapping for an internal state of a service. (Page 9, Section 6: Paragraph 3)

As per claims 7 and 22, Hoschek / DMTF disclose the method of claim 1, and Hoschek discloses wherein said OSDML defines a set of rules for defining and mapping service data change notification subscriptions from a corresponding native resource implementation thereof. (Page 10-11, Data Publication, Paragraph 4, Table 2)

As per claims 8 and 23, Hoschek / DMTF disclose the method of claim 1, and Hoschek discloses further comprising: defining a flexible framework engine for processing rules and mappings defined by said OSMDL. (Page 11: Table 2)

As per claims 9 and 24, Hoschek / DMTF disclose the method of claim 8, and Hoschek discloses wherein said framework engine includes a uniform interface to services implementation. (Page 10, Paragraph 2)

As per claims 10 and 25, Hoschek / DMTF disclose the method of claim 8, and Hoschek discloses wherein said framework engine includes a pluggable provider interface, said pluggable provider interface being configured to support language extensions and new service data providers. (Page 13, Conclusions, Paragraphs 1 and 2)

As per claims 11 and 26, Hoschek / DMTF disclose the method of claim 10, and Hoschek discloses wherein said framework engine is configured to support at least one of: parameterization, flexible data source binding and pluggable script execution. (Page 5, network protocol bindings; Page 13, Conclusion , Paragraph 3)

As per claims 12 and 27, Hoschek / DMTF disclose the method of claim 10, and Hoschek discloses wherein said framework engine further comprises a document repository. (Page 9, Section 6: Paragraph 4)

As per claims 13 and 28, Hoschek / DMTF disclose the method of claim 10, and Hoschek discloses wherein said framework engine further comprises a generic interface for supporting OSDML instance data retrieval. (Page 9, Section 6: Paragraph 3)

As per claims 15 and 30, Hoschek / DMTF disclose the method of claim 10, and Hoschek discloses wherein said engine is configured to map service data definitions to relational database schema. (Page 9, Section 6: Paragraph 2 and 3; Page 11: Table 2)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoschek (Wolfgang Hoschek, November 2002, Int'l. IEEE/ACM Supercomputing Conference (SC 2002), Baltimore, USA, November 2002. IEEE Computer Society Press, "The Web Service Discovery Architecture", pages 1-15) / DMTF (Specification DSP 0201, Version 2.1, May 02, 2002, "Specification for the Representation of CIM in XML, pages 1-31) further in view of Bhat (US 7,062,516).

As per claims 14 and 29, Hoschek / DMTF disclose the method of claim 10. Honschek fails to disclose wherein said pluggable provider interface comprises at least one of: a common information object manager (CIMOM) and a database adapter. Bhat discloses wherein said pluggable provider interface comprises at least one of: a common information object manager (CIMOM) and a database adapter. (Col 7 lines 16-33) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to disclose wherein said pluggable provider interface comprises at least one of: a common information object manager (CIMOM) and a database adapter in the disclosure of Hoscek. The motivation for doing so would have been to enable distributed system management to take place between management systems and applications. (Col 1 lines 46-54)

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2141

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chirag R Patel whose telephone number is (571)272-7966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pairedirect.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

Chirag Patel
Patent Examiner
AU 2141

C.P. C-P.



JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER